

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,497	11/14/2001	Leola Henry	PIL0123/US	3217
33072 75	07/01/2004		EXAMINER	
KAGAN BINDER, PLLC SUITE 200, MAPLE ISLAND BUILDING 221 MAIN STREET NORTH STILLWATER, MN 55082			TRAN LIEN, THUY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	(3)			
Advisory Action	10/001,497	HENRY ET AL.				
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Lien T Tran	1761				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess			
THE REPLY FILED 15 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to aviginal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applicat	to a tion in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection.	on. See MPEP			
ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officinely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The appro originally set in the final (opriate extension Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	3.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed a	amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	Γ place the			
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: none.						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-16</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme						
10. Other:	P	LIEN TRAN RIMARY EXAMINER	 -			
		Goup 1700				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the argument is not persuasive for reason of record. The excerpt from the cookbook is not deemed sufficient to define the claimed product over the prior art of record. The examiner recognizes that there is a difference between bread and biscuit; however, it is the examiner's position that it would have been obvious to make a biscuit dough from the disclosure in the prior art..